

Uc 281.9  
A 281.9  
A 98A

Agricultural Economic Report No. 79

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

JUL 21 1965

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

# URBAN AND RURAL LEVELS OF LIVING: 1960

Economic Research Service / U.S. Department of Agriculture

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Highlights .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Age, color, and regional variations .....	2
Family income and levels of living .....	4
Occupation, income, and levels of living .....	6
Definitions and explanations .....	8

## HIGHLIGHTS

Information on five indicators of level of living (availability of automobile, telephone, hot and cold water piped inside the house, a house in sound condition, and a person-per-room ratio) is used to compare the levels of living of the urban and rural populations in 1960.

This report is based on a special analysis of the 1-in-1,000-sample tabulations from the 1960 Census of Population and Housing and presents heretofore unavailable comparisons of urban and rural levels of living. Attention is focused on households headed by a male employed in the civilian labor force and on the relationships between indicators of level of living and factors such as age and color of the household head, family income, occupation of the head, and region of residence. Some highlights follow:

1. Availability of an automobile was the only indicator of level of living reported by a higher proportion of rural than urban households. The proportion of households reporting all four items included in a list of indicators (availability of an automobile, telephone, hot and cold piped water, and sound housing) was 73 percent in urban areas, 60 percent in rural-nonfarm areas, and 44 percent for farm residents.

2. In general, households headed by a male worker 35-54 years old had a higher proportion of each of the indicators of level of living than did households where the head was 14-34 or 55 years old and over.

3. White-nonwhite differences in indicators of level of living were much more pronounced than were urban-rural or age differences. Less than half as many non-white (35 percent) as white (72 percent) households reported all items included in the list of indicators. About half of farm whites, compared with only 4 percent of farm nonwhites, reported all items in the list of indicators.

4. Within the white rural population, lower proportions of Southern than Northern or Western residents reported the level-of-living indicators. In the Southern rural population, color differences were substantially greater than urban-rural differences.

5. Family income was closely related to the presence of the level-of-living indicators--only 31 percent of families with incomes of less than \$3,000, compared with 74 percent of those with incomes of \$3,000 and over, reported all items in the list of indicators.

6. Differences in level of living were associated with the occupation of the household head. For example, among families with incomes of less than \$5,000, 6 out of 10 households headed by a white-collar worker compared with about 4 out of 10 households headed by a farm operator reported all items in the list of indicators.

7. In the South, differences in level of living were largely urban-rural differences, whereas in the North and West, the differences were mainly between farm and nonfarm (rural-nonfarm and urban) residents.

# URBAN AND RURAL LEVELS OF LIVING, 1960 <sup>1/</sup>

James D. Cowhig  
Farm Population Branch  
Economic and Statistical Analysis Division  
Economic Research Service <sup>2/</sup>

## INTRODUCTION

Farm operator level-of-living indexes, published by the Department of Agriculture for the period 1940-59, provide a basis for comparing the levels of living of farm operators in various parts of the United States and for tracing changes in levels of living. <sup>3/</sup>

The purpose of this report is to supply comparable indicators of level of living for the urban and rural populations of the United States; to describe urban-rural differences in levels of living; and to determine variations in level of living when factors such as age, color, region of residence, family income, and occupation of the household head are considered.

Source of data.--Data were derived from the 1-in-1,000 sample of tabulations from the 1960 Census of Population and Housing and refer to the 36 million households headed by a male employed in the civilian labor force at the time of the Census in April 1960. <sup>4/</sup> The principal advantage of limiting analysis to households in which the head is an employed male in the civilian labor force is to enhance comparability by focusing on populations with similar characteristics, thus eliminating the effects of statistically infrequent circumstances on urban-rural and white-nonwhite comparisons. The result is that the description of level of living based on these data probably presents a more favorable overall picture than if data were also included on unrelated individuals, the more marginal members of the labor force, and on households headed by women.

Since the data are from a sample of census tabulations, they are subject to sampling variability. Because sampling errors may be large in cases where percentages are based on a small number of households, differences between categories should be interpreted with this in mind. In general, only statistically significant differences are discussed in the text and percentages or averages are not shown where the base is less than 100,000 (100 sample households). For a statement of sampling variability and for an explanation of the terms used in this report, see the section Definitions and Explanations, p. 8.

---

1/ This report was prepared under the general direction of Louis J. Ducoff, Chief, Farm Population Branch.

2/ Dr. Cowhig transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in January 1965.

3/ Cowhig, James D. Farm Operator Level of Living Indexes for Counties of the United States 1950 and 1959. Stat. Bul. No. 321, U. S. Dept. Agr., 1962.

The index for 1959 was based on a formula in which weights were assigned to the following variables: proportion of farms reporting automobiles, telephones, home freezers; and average value of sales, land, and buildings per farm.

4/ For a detailed description see: One-in-a Thousand Sample Description and Technical Documentation. U. S. Bureau of the Census. Washington, D.C., 1961.

Selection of indicators of level of living.--In keeping with the customary emphasis in analyses of levels of living, the measures selected refer to the availability of goods, services, and amenities of economic or social benefit. Since the unit of analysis is the household and not the individual, one criterion for selection of the item was that the measure be an indicator of the level of living of all household members.

Of the indicators available from census data, the following were selected for the reasons indicated. (1) Availability of an automobile. For many households, particularly in rural areas, an automobile is necessary for the conduct of the farm business or for obtaining goods and services. (2) Availability of telephone was selected as an indication of access to an important means of communication by which other services can be obtained with some efficiency. (3) Hot and cold water piped inside the structure is generally considered to be a prerequisite for modern sanitation practices and cleanliness. (4) Dwelling units in sound condition presumably supply more adequate housing than do deteriorated or dilapidated units. (5) A list of indicators was derived based on the proportion of all households reporting all items 1 through 4. The list of indicators is the proportion of households with an automobile, telephone, hot and cold piped water inside the structure, and occupying a housing unit in sound condition. (6) The proportion of housing units with 1.01 or more persons per room was selected as a indicator of crowded living conditions and reflected the relationship between family size and housing space.

Some of these indicators are related to the characteristics of area of residence. For example, telephone availability is dependent on facilities installed in the local area as well as on the ability to pay for the service. The number of persons per room is in part a function of age, size of the housing unit, family size, and ability to pay the cost of housing. None of the items are a luxury but are considered necessary for families to realize the generally accepted standard of living in the United States.

The most important limitation of analyses of levels of living is the difficulty of bridging the gap between the concept and the data required for satisfactory measurement. There is general agreement that an adequate description of levels of living would require data on subjects such as health, food and nutrition, and conditions of work, plus information on nonmaterial aspects of living conditions such as recreation and entertainment. It is also generally agreed that information on these aspects of level of living is seldom, if ever, available for an entire population.

In view of the limited data available for use as indicators of level of living, it should be obvious that the items included in this analysis represent only a partial description of the levels of living of the urban and rural populations of the United States in 1960. The data do not permit valid inferences about the subjective aspects of certain living conditions.

## **AGE, COLOR, AND REGIONAL VARIATIONS**

Two of the six indicators of level of living used showed comparatively minor differences between urban and rural households in the United States (table 1, see p.10). Automobile ownership was reported by 9 out of 10 households and was more common in rural than in urban areas. The proportion of dwelling units with more than 1 person per room ranged from 12 percent in urban areas to 17 percent in rural areas in 1960. On each of the other measures, including the list of indicators, substantially more urban than rural households reported the item in question. The sharpest differences were the presence of hot piped water inside the structure and condition of the housing unit. Hot and cold water piped inside the structure--almost universal to urban areas of the country--was reported by 8 out of 10 rural-non-

farm and 7 out of 10 rural-farm households. Similar, but less marked, differences occurred with respect to telephone availability and the condition of the dwelling unit. The proportion of households reporting all items included in the list of indicators ranged from 73 percent in urban areas to 44 percent for farm residents.

The pattern of automobile ownership differed from the patterns of the other items in that a higher proportion of rural than urban households had an automobile available. In part, this is because an automobile may be a necessity for most farm families and for families living in the less densely settled open-country areas where public transportation is not available.

Age.--The age of the household head is associated with level of family income and stage of the family life cycle, e.g., presence or absence of dependent children. It is an indication of the time that the family has had to acquire various goods and facilities. In general, a higher proportion of households headed by a male 35-54 years old reported each of the indicators of level of living than did households headed by either a younger or older worker. The low proportion of households headed by an older worker with more than 1 person per room is because many of these households were composed of husband and wife only. Age was less closely related to variations in indicators of level of living than was urban-rural residence. The same pattern of urban-rural differences was characteristic of each of the three broad age groups.

Color.--Much more pronounced than either residence or age differences were the consistent white-nonwhite differences in indicators of level of living. Only about a third of all nonwhite households in the United States in 1960 reported all of the items included in the list of indicators--less than half the proportion of white households. And only about 5 percent of all rural nonwhite households, compared with about 59 percent of rural white households, reported the items in the list of indicators. Only in the case of water supply did the proportion of urban nonwhites equal or exceed the proportion of farm whites with the item.

Regional variations.--Regional comparisons are limited to two broad areas: The South, and the North and West combined (table 1). Because 89 percent of all rural nonwhite households were in the South in 1960, regional data are shown for whites and nonwhites.

Comparisons of the white urban populations of the two regions show that only in the case of telephone availability were regional differences important--90 percent of white urban households in the North and West and 84 percent of those in the South reported availability of telephones. Automobile ownership was almost universal in the rural areas of the North and West and was more common in rural than in urban areas. In the South, there were only minor residence differences in automobile ownership, but the Southern pattern of higher rates of ownership in urban areas was the reverse of that in the North and West.

Without exception, the white rural population in the South had lower proportions reporting the level of living items than in the North and West. In the South, about 43 percent of all white rural households reported all the items included in the list of indicators compared with 67 percent of white rural households in the North and West.

Within the South, color differences were substantially greater than urban-rural differences. On four of the six indicators, urban nonwhites ranked below rural-farm whites--the exceptions were availability of telephone and type of water supply. Only 4 percent of Southern nonwhite farm households, compared with 33 percent of the white farm households, reported all the items included in the list of

indicators. Almost 6 out of 10 nonwhite farm dwelling units, compared with about 1 in 6 of white farm dwelling units, had more than 1 person per room.

Only in the case of automobile ownership did more than half of farm nonwhites in the South report any of the indicators of level of living. The proportion of farm nonwhites reporting the other items was considerably less than half: Only 5 percent of Southern farm nonwhites reported hot piped water inside the structure, 13 percent, a telephone; 23 percent lived in a house in sound condition; and 44 percent lived in an uncrowded dwelling unit.

The small number of nonwhite rural households in the North and West precludes detailed comparisons by color and urban-rural residence, but it is possible to compare urban whites and nonwhites. As shown by the list of indicators, the position of the urban nonwhites in the South was less advantageous than in the rest of the United States--about 1 in 4 of Southern urban nonwhites, compared with 2 out of 5 of those in the North and West, reported all of the items included in the list of indicators. Moreover, on each of the indicators, the percentage point difference between whites and nonwhites was greater in the South than in the North and West. Even water supply, closely associated with urban residence, showed sharp regional differences; about two-thirds of Southern nonwhites, compared with 9 out of 10 of nonwhites in the North and West, reported hot and cold piped water inside the structure.

## FAMILY INCOME AND LEVELS OF LIVING

Although family income is an important determinant of level of living in that it limits the amount and type of goods and services that the family can afford, the use of money income in a single year as an indicator of level of living has a number of limitations. One year's income may not be representative of the income history of the family nor does it necessarily indicate anything about its use. Moreover, nonmoney income is an important aspect of the level of living of both farm and nonfarm families. Farm families may produce a substantial amount of the food consumed by the family. Supplementary wage benefits have become increasingly important for nonfarm workers.

As shown in table 2, family income in 1959 was closely related to the proportion of households reporting the various indicators of level of living. For the 36 million households represented in this analysis, about a quarter of those with incomes of less than \$1,000 reported all the items included in the list of indicators. For incomes of \$5,000 and over, the proportions ranged from 71 to 90 percent. The indicator with the widest range was telephone availability. Less than half of all families with incomes less than \$2,000 but over 9 out of 10 of those with incomes of \$7,000 and over reported a telephone.

In the aggregate, differences in measures of level of living were comparatively unimportant for the 41 percent of all households with incomes of \$7,000 or more.

Color and income.--Because of the sharp white-nonwhite differences in the distribution of family income--three times as many nonwhite as white families had incomes of less than \$3,000--differences among the lower income categories are disproportionately affected by the levels of living of nonwhites. For example, only 2 percent of nonwhites with incomes of less than \$1,000 had all items included in the list of indicators compared with over a third of white households with similar incomes. At each income level, at least twice as many nonwhite as white households had 1.01 or more persons per room. The high proportion of nonwhite households with 1.01 or more persons per room reflects differences in fertility and family size, family living arrangements, and, of course, the housing space available

to the family. Even among those with incomes of \$7,000 and over, only about 71 percent as many nonwhites as whites reported all the items included in the list of indicators.

Income, urban-rural residence, and color variations.--A comparison of urban and rural families above and below the \$3,000 family income figure shows residence, color, and income differentials as indicators of level of living (table 3). Low-income urban families more frequently than rural families reported a telephone, hot and cold piped water, and sound housing, and less frequently reported availability of an automobile. Within the low-income category, there was little difference in the proportion of dwelling units overcrowded.

Within the low-income rural population, farm households more often than nonfarm households had each of the items. Among rural households with incomes of \$3,000 and over, there were no differences in 3 of the indicators (automobile, telephone, and crowding) but in the case of water supply, condition of the housing unit, and the list of indicators, higher proportions of rural-nonfarm than farm households reported each of the items.

As in the earlier comparisons, residence and income differences were much less important than color differences. For example, only 2 percent of rural nonwhites compared with about 35 percent of rural whites with incomes of less than \$3,000 reported the summary items. In urban areas, the percentages were 16 and 41 percent, respectively. In rural areas, the one indicator that showed no white-nonwhite differences of any importance was automobile ownership among persons with incomes of \$3,000 and over.

The low level of living of rural nonwhites is illustrated by the fact that about 1 out of 7 had a telephone, 1 out of 12 lived in a house with hot and cold piped water, 1 out of 4 lived in a house in sound condition, and 1 out of 2 lived in an uncrowded dwelling unit.

The list of indicators showed that in both the urban and rural populations proportionately twice as many whites in the higher as in the lower income category reported all the items included in the list of indicators; for nonwhites, the proportions were about 3 to 1 in urban areas and about 6 to 1 in rural areas.

Lower-income farm whites were at about the same level of living--as judged by the list of indicators--as lower-income urban whites, but among whites with incomes of \$3,000 and over, 8 out of 10 urban households, 7 out of 10 rural-nonfarm households, and about 6 out of 10 rural-farm units reported the items in the list of indicators.

There were proportionately two and one-half times as many families with incomes of less than \$3,000 in the South as in the North and West and proportionately two-thirds as many with incomes of \$7,000 and over (table 4). Roughly half (47 percent) of white farm families and a quarter of white rural-nonfarm families in the South had incomes of less than \$3,000 in 1959; comparable percentages for the North and West were 36 and 11.

In the North and West, residence differences in level of living--as indicated by the list of indicators--were greatest between the farm and nonfarm populations, whereas in the South, differences were greatest between the urban and rural populations. 5/ With the exception of the lowest income families, there were no important regional differences in level of living between the urban populations of the

---

5/ The nonfarm population includes urban and rural-nonfarm residents; the rural population includes rural-nonfarm and rural-farm residents.



two regions. Within the rural populations, however, substantially more households in the North and West than in the South reported all items included in the list of indicators. These differences were characteristic of each income level, but were less marked for the white than for the total populations of the two regions. This was largely because of the substantially lower levels of living of rural nonwhites, concentrated in the Southern States.

Among families with incomes of \$7,000 and over, about half the white farm families in the South compared with about 70 percent in the rest of the United States reported the items included in the list of indicators. Regional differences between white rural-nonfarm families were smaller and there were only negligible differences between the higher-income urban populations of the two regions. Thus, these indicators are of very limited value in comparisons of comparatively high-income populations.

In part, residence variations as indicators of level of living between the South and North and West reflect the higher proportion of Southern households with incomes under \$2,000 and the lesser availability of telephone facilities and modern water supply in the rural areas of the South.

### OCCUPATION, INCOME, AND LEVELS OF LIVING

About half (47 percent) of all households in which the head was employed as a farm operator or farm manager in 1960 reported all of the items included in the list of indicators. This ranged from about 4 out of 10 for those with incomes of less than \$3,000 in 1959 to about 6 out of 10 with incomes of \$5,000 and over (table 5). Only about a quarter of the families headed by a farm laborer reported all the items, ranging from about 12 percent of those with incomes of less than \$3,000 to 42 percent of those with incomes of \$5,000 and over.

In general, the relationship between the indicators of level of living and major occupation category paralleled commonly assumed status differences among occupations. That is, the white-collar occupations ranked highest, followed by the higher skilled manual workers, service workers and nonfarm laborers, and with persons in farm occupations at the lowest level.

Even among occupation groups with similar levels of family income there were differences in indicators of level of living. Among families with incomes of \$10,000 and over, the percentages with the four items included in the list of indicators ranged from 94 for professional and nonfarm managerial workers, to 82 for service workers and nonfarm laborers. Among those with incomes of less than \$5,000 the range was from 64 percent for the higher-status occupations to about 37 percent for nonfarm laborers, service workers, and persons employed in farm occupations.

Color differences.--Within the two white-collar occupation categories, color differences in levels of living were comparatively minor, even though proportionately more whites than nonwhites reported each of the items and more whites than nonwhites reported all the items included in the list of indicators. Within the other nonfarm occupation categories, however, roughly twice as many whites as nonwhites had all four items included in the list of indicators. Only 3 percent of households headed by a nonwhite farm operator and 13 percent of those headed by a nonwhite farm laborer reported all the items in the list of indicators.

The number of cases was too small to permit detailed comparison of color differences by occupation when age and income were controlled. However, limited comparisons are possible for the occupation groups of manual and service workers in the age group 35-54 years old and by broad income categories (table 6). Even

when age, major occupation category, and level of family income were considered, there were substantial differences between whites and nonwhites in the proportions reporting the indicators of level of living. For instance, among craftsman and operatives aged 35-54 with family incomes of less than \$5,000, 46 percent of whites but only 18 percent of nonwhites reported all the items in the list of indicators; among those with incomes of \$7,000 and over, 85 percent of whites and 61 percent of nonwhites reported the items in the list of indicators. 6/

Related data on the aged and on primary families.--More detailed information on the housing of the aged and of primary families, derived from published reports of the 1960 Censuses, permits comparisons of indicators of level of living (1) for households headed by a person 60 years old and over, and (2) for primary families with children under 18 years of age.

In 1960, about three-quarters (74 percent) of all nonfarm households in which the head was 60 years old or over, were living in nondilapidated houses with all plumbing facilities compared with about half (48 percent) of all farm households headed by an older person. 7/ Among older nonwhites, about a third (36 percent) of nonfarm houses and only 7 percent of farm houses were in sound condition and had all plumbing facilities.

The proportion of primary families with children under 18 years of age living in houses which were not dilapidated and which had all plumbing facilities ranged from 93 percent for urban families to 68 percent for all rural families (table 7). 8/ Among families with incomes of less than \$2,000 in 1959, 71 percent of all urban families but only 30 percent of all rural families were living in nondilapidated housing with all plumbing facilities. Within the rural population, the housing conditions of nonwhite primary families with incomes of \$8,000 and over resembled those of whites with incomes in the \$2,000-3,999 range. Color differences in housing conditions were less sharp in urban areas and were most apparent in the lower income categories; for example, about half of the nonwhite families compared with over 7 out of 10 white families with incomes of less than \$2,000 were living in nondilapidated housing with all plumbing facilities.

These data show that the housing conditions of older farm residents were less favorable than those of older urban residents. They also show sharp urban-rural and white-nonwhite differences in the housing occupied by families with children; and that the housing occupied by comparatively high-income rural nonwhite families resembled that occupied by rural white families at a much lower level of family income.

---

6/ More detailed data on income and specific occupation might cause these color differences to disappear.

7/ U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Housing: 1960. Volume VII, Housing of Senior Citizens. Washington, 1962. Tables A - 5 and A - 5-a. Units with "all plumbing facilities" were those with hot and cold water inside the structure and flush toilet and bathtub (or shower) inside the structure for exclusive use of the occupants of the unit. The published data permit only farm-nonfarm comparisons.

8/ U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Families. PC(2)-4A. Washington, 1963. Table 33.

## DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Age of person is age on his last birthday.

Residence--The urban population includes all persons living (a) in places of 2,500 inhabitants or more, incorporated as cities, boroughs, villages, and towns (except towns in New England, New York, and Wisconsin); (b) the densely settled urban fringe, whether incorporated or unincorporated, of urbanized areas; (c) towns in New England and townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania which contained no incorporated municipalities as subdivisions and had either 25,000 inhabitants or more or a population of 2,500 to 25,000 and a density of 1,500 persons or more per square mile; (d) counties in States other than the New England States, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania that had no incorporated municipalities within their boundaries and a density of 1,500 or more per square mile; and (e) unincorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants or more.

The population not classified as urban constitutes the rural population. The rural population is divided into the rural-farm, all persons living on farms, and the rural-nonfarm, the remaining rural population. In 1960, places of 10 or more acres were counted as farms if sales of farm products amounted to \$50 or more in 1959. Places of less than 10 acres were counted as farms if sales of farm products amounted to at least \$250 in 1959.

Persons living in group quarters on institutional grounds, in summer camps, or motels, were classified as nonfarm residents; persons in households paying cash rent for a house and yard only which did not include land used for farming were counted as nonfarm. In 1960, no effort was made to identify farm population in urban areas.

Region refers to the South (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and the District of Columbia) and North and West (all other States).

Color refers to the division of population into two groups, white and nonwhite. The color group designated as "nonwhite" includes Negroes, American Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, Hawaiians, Asian Indians, Malaysians, Eskimos, Aleuts, etc. Persons of Mexican birth or ancestry who are not definitely of Indian or other nonwhite race are classified as white. In 1960, 92 percent of all nonwhites were Negroes.

Employed persons comprise all civilians 14 years old and over who were either (a) "at work"--those who did any work for pay or profit, or worked without pay for 15 hours or more on a family farm or in a family business; or (b) were "with a job but not at work"--those who did not work and were not looking for work but had a job or business from which they were temporarily absent because of bad weather, industrial dispute, vacation, illness, or other personal reasons.

Civilian labor force includes all persons classified as employed or unemployed. It does not include members of the armed forces who are included as members of the total labor force.

Occupation refers to the job held during the week for which employment status was reported. For persons employed at two or more jobs, the data refer to the job at which the person worked the greatest number of hours.

Total family income represents the combined incomes of all family members. It is the sum of amounts reported separately for wages or salary income, self-employment income, and other income. It represents the amount received before deduc-

tions for personal income taxes, social security, bond purchases, union dues, etc. Self-employment income is net money income (gross receipts minus operating expenses) from a business, farm, or professional enterprise. Other income includes money income received from such sources as net rents, interest, dividends, and all other money income.

A family consists of 2 or more persons in the same household who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption. All persons living in one household who are related to each other are regarded as one family.

Head of the family is the member reported as the head by the household respondent. However, if a married woman living with her husband is reported as the head, her husband is classified as the head for the purpose of census tabulations.

Housing unit refers to house, apartment, or other group of rooms, or a single room when occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Trailers, tents, boats, or railroad cars are included if they are occupied as housing units. They are excluded if vacant, used only for extra sleeping space or vacations, or used only for business. Hotel accommodations are housing units if they are the usual residence of occupants.

Persons per room was computed for each occupied housing unit by dividing the number of persons by the number of rooms in the unit.

Sound housing is defined as that which has no defects, or only slight defects which normally are corrected during the course of regular maintenance.

A unit is classified as having a telephone if there is a telephone available to the occupants, whether located inside or outside the unit. One telephone may serve the occupants of several units.

Automobiles represent the number of passenger automobiles, including station wagons, owned or regularly used by any of the occupants of the housing unit. Not counted were taxis, pickup trucks, larger trucks, and dismantled or dilapidated cars in a early stage of being junked.

Hot piped water inside structure. A housing unit is classified as having "piped water inside structure" if there is running water inside the structure and it is available to occupants of the unit. A unit has piped hot water even though the hot water is not supplied continuously.

Table 1.—Percent of households reporting specified items by age and color of employed male head in civilian labor force, urban-rural residence and region, United States, 1960

(Percents not shown where base is less than 100,000)

Age, color, urban-rural residence, and region	Total households with employed male head in civilian labor force	Percent with					
		Automobile available	Telephone available	Hot piped water inside structure	House in sound condition	Items (1) through (4)	More than 1.00 person per room
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Thou.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
United States:							
Total, 14 years old and over	35,722	90	82	91	86	69	13
Urban	25,583	88	86	97	89	73	12
Rural nonfarm	7,339	93	73	81	79	60	17
Rural farm	2,800	92	68	69	71	44	16
14-34	10,035	90	76	91	84	64	18
Urban	7,326	89	80	97	87	67	17
Rural nonfarm	2,224	94	66	80	79	56	22
Rural farm	485	90	66	67	68	47	20
35-54	18,360	91	85	92	86	73	14
Urban	13,183	90	89	97	90	77	12
Rural nonfarm	3,691	94	77	82	79	64	18
Rural farm	1,486	95	69	70	70	43	21
55 and over	7,327	85	84	90	86	66	4
Urban	5,074	83	89	96	90	70	3
Rural nonfarm	1,424	90	74	79	78	58	6
Rural farm	829	89	68	68	75	46	5
White, 14 years old and over	32,866	92	84	93	88	72	12
Urban	23,354	90	88	98	91	76	10
Rural nonfarm	6,927	95	76	84	81	63	16
Rural farm	2,585	94	73	74	75	49	12
14-34	9,204	93	79	93	86	68	16
Urban	6,644	92	82	98	89	70	15
Rural nonfarm	2,115	96	69	83	81	59	21
Rural farm	445	94	70	73	72	52	16
35-54	16,849	93	87	94	89	76	12
Urban	12,011	92	91	98	92	81	11
Rural nonfarm	3,482	95	80	86	82	67	16
Rural farm	1,356	97	75	76	74	48	17
55 and over	6,813	87	85	92	88	69	3
Urban	4,699	84	90	98	92	73	2
Rural nonfarm	1,330	92	77	84	81	61	5
Rural farm	784	90	71	71	77	48	3
Nonwhite, 14 years old and over	2,856	64	58	68	59	35	33
Urban	2,229	63	67	83	67	36	29
Rural nonfarm	412	65	30	19	36	5	43
Rural farm	215	73	15	9	24	4	54
14-34	831	58	48	70	62	23	40
Urban	682	59	55	83	69	29	37
Rural nonfarm	109	54	18	14	36	17	50
Rural farm	40	-	-	-	-	-	-
35-54	1,511	69	62	69	59	39	34
Urban	1,172	66	71	84	67	40	29
Rural nonfarm	209	77	37	23	38	8	49
Rural farm	130	80	15	9	22	3	62
55 and over	514	61	61	63	55	33	15
Urban	375	62	75	80	64	35	12
Rural nonfarm	94	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	45	-	-	-	-	-	-

Continued-

Table 1.—Percent of households reporting specified items by age and color of employed male head in civilian labor force, urban-rural residence and region, United States, 1960 - Continued

(Percents not shown where base is less than 100,000)

Age, color, urban-rural residence, and region	Total households with employed male head in civilian labor force	Percent with					
		Automobile available	Telephone available	Hot piped water inside structure	House in sound condition	Items (1) through (4)	More than 1.00 person per room
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Thou.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
<b>North and West:</b>							
Total, 14 years old and over	25,694	90	87	96	88	72	11
Urban	19,454	88	88	98	90	74	11
Rural nonfarm	4,548	97	83	89	84	70	13
Rural farm	1,692	96	82	80	77	57	10
14-34	7,034	91	82	96	87	68	16
Urban	5,416	89	83	98	88	69	16
Rural nonfarm	1,318	98	78	89	84	66	18
Rural farm	300	96	82	82	76	65	13
35-54	13,289	92	89	96	89	76	12
Urban	10,099	90	91	98	91	78	12
Rural nonfarm	2,311	98	85	90	84	73	13
Rural farm	879	98	83	81	76	54	14
55 and over	5,371	86	88	94	89	69	3
Urban	3,939	82	90	98	91	71	3
Rural nonfarm	919	95	82	86	83	68	3
Rural farm	513	93	82	78	80	57	2
White, 14 years old and over	24,321	92	88	96	89	74	10
Urban	18,148	90	90	99	92	76	10
Rural nonfarm	4,498	98	83	90	84	71	13
Rural farm	1,675	97	83	80	77	58	10
14-34	6,623	93	83	96	88	70	15
Urban	5,021	91	85	98	89	72	14
Rural nonfarm	1,308	98	78	89	84	67	18
Rural farm	294	98	83	83	77	66	13
35-54	12,553	93	90	96	90	78	11
Urban	9,399	92	92	99	92	80	11
Rural nonfarm	2,283	98	86	91	84	74	13
Rural farm	871	99	84	81	76	55	14
55 and over	5,145	87	88	94	90	71	2
Urban	3,728	83	91	98	92	73	2
Rural nonfarm	907	95	83	87	84	68	3
Rural farm	510	93	82	78	80	57	2
Nonwhite, 14 years old and over	1,373	64	73	92	70	40	26
Urban	1,306	63	74	93	72	41	25
Rural nonfarm	50	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	17	-	-	-	-	-	-
14-34	411	61	64	92	72	33	34
Urban	395	61	65	94	73	34	33
Rural nonfarm	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
35-54	736	67	77	92	71	44	26
Urban	700	65	78	94	72	46	25
Rural nonfarm	28	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
55 and over	226	60	74	87	66	35	11
Urban	211	60	76	90	68	35	10
Rural nonfarm	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	3	-	-	-	-	-	-

Continued-

Table 1.—Percent of households reporting specified items by age and color of employed male head in civilian labor force, urban-rural residence and region, United States, 1960 - Continued

(Percents not shown where base is less than 100,000)

(Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000)							
Age, color, urban-rural residence, and region	Total households with employed male head in civilian labor force	Percent with					
		Automobile available	Telephone available	Hot piped water inside structure	House in sound condition	Items (1) through (4)	More than 1.00 person per room
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Thou.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
South:							
Total, 14 years old and over	10,028	88	70	81	79	61	18
Urban	6,129	89	80	93	86	68	15
Rural nonfarm	2,791	86	58	67	71	41	24
Rural farm	1,108	86	47	51	62	26	24
14-34	3,001	87	62	82	79	55	22
Urban	1,910	87	70	92	84	60	19
Rural nonfarm	906	88	49	66	72	37	28
Rural farm	185	80	39	43	54	20	31
35-54	5,071	90	75	81	79	66	20
Urban	3,084	91	84	93	86	74	15
Rural nonfarm	1,380	87	64	68	71	46	27
Rural farm	607	91	49	53	61	28	30
55 and over	1,956	83	72	78	78	59	7
Urban	1,135	85	85	92	85	68	5
Rural nonfarm	505	80	59	65	68	36	11
Rural farm	316	81	46	52	68	27	8
White, 14 years old and over	8,545	92	75	87	84	67	15
Urban	5,206	93	84	97	90	75	11
Rural nonfarm	2,429	89	63	75	76	47	21
Rural farm	910	90	54	61	70	33	17
14-34	2,581	92	66	87	83	61	18
Urban	1,623	93	75	97	88	67	15
Rural nonfarm	807	92	53	73	76	42	25
Rural farm	151	86	46	53	63	25	24
35-54	4,296	93	80	88	85	72	16
Urban	2,612	95	89	97	91	81	12
Rural nonfarm	1,199	89	69	75	77	52	23
Rural farm	485	94	58	65	71	36	21
55 and over	1,668	87	76	85	83	64	5
Urban	971	88	87	96	89	72	4
Rural nonfarm	423	85	65	76	75	42	8
Rural farm	274	85	52	59	73	31	5
Nonwhite, 14 years old and over	1,483	65	44	47	49	26	39
Urban	923	62	57	68	61	28	33
Rural nonfarm	362	63	26	14	34	3	45
Rural farm	198	75	13	5	23	4	56
14-34	420	56	33	48	52	14	46
Urban	287	55	42	67	63	21	43
Rural nonfarm	99	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	34	-	-	-	-	-	-
35-54	775	71	47	47	48	28	43
Urban	472	66	61	69	60	30	34
Rural nonfarm	181	73	32	17	36	6	51
Rural farm	122	82	14	7	22	3	63
55 and over	288	62	50	43	46	20	19
Urban	164	64	73	69	58	34	13
Rural nonfarm	82	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural farm	42	-	-	-	-	-	-

1/ Less than one percent.

U. S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960. 1/1000 Sample.

Table 2.—Percent of households reporting specified items by age and color of employed male head in civilian labor force, and family income in 1959, United States, 1960

(Percents independently rounded and do not always equal 100)							
Age and color of household head and family income		Percent in each income category reporting					
		Automobile	Telephone	Hot piped	House	Items	More than
		available	available	water inside	in	(1)	1.00
				structure	sound	through	person
					condition	(4)	per
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	room
		Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Total:							
14 years old and over		90	82	91	86	73	13
Number . . (Thousands)	35,722						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	3	69	44	55	56	25	22
1,000-1,999	4	74	48	60	62	30	21
2,000-2,999	6	76	56	73	68	34	21
3,000-3,999	8	83	68	84	74	43	19
4,000-4,999	11	86	76	91	82	57	16
5,000-6,999	26	92	87	96	88	71	14
7,000-9,999	23	95	93	98	93	83	10
10,000 and over	18	97	97	99	96	90	7
14-34		91	76	91	84	70	18
Number . . (Thousands)	10,035						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	2	65	40	56	56	22	31
1,000-1,999	4	69	37	61	61	22	34
2,000-2,999	8	75	43	73	67	24	29
3,000-3,999	11	86	58	86	72	42	26
4,000-4,999	14	88	71	93	84	56	19
5,000-6,999	31	93	84	97	89	71	16
7,000-9,999	22	96	92	99	92	84	12
10,000 and over	8	98	95	99	96	90	9
35-54		92	85	92	86	76	14
Number . . (Thousands)	18,360						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	2	73	48	55	54	28	27
1,000-1,999	3	77	49	58	59	33	25
2,000-2,999	5	78	58	69	64	35	26
3,000-3,999	7	81	71	81	72	42	22
4,000-4,999	10	86	77	90	80	56	18
5,000-6,999	25	92	88	95	87	72	16
7,000-9,999	26	95	94	98	93	85	11
10,000 and over	22	98	97	99	96	91	7
55 and over		85	84	90	86	70	4
Number . . (Thousands)	7,327						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	4	65	42	53	59	23	7
1,000-1,999	7	74	57	62	67	33	6
2,000-2,999	9	75	70	79	74	47	5
3,000-3,999	10	80	79	86	81	47	4
4,000-4,999	11	81	82	92	85	60	4
5,000-6,999	20	86	88	95	89	68	3
7,000-9,999	18	89	93	98	92	76	4
10,000 and over	20	94	96	99	96	88	3
White:							
14 years old and over		92	84	93	88	75	12
Number . . (Thousands)	32,866						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	2	76	52	65	64	35	16
1,000-1,999	4	81	55	67	70	38	16
2,000-2,999	6	82	59	78	72	38	17
3,000-3,999	8	86	70	87	77	46	17
4,000-4,999	11	88	77	92	84	59	14
5,000-6,999	27	93	87	96	89	73	13
7,000-9,999	24	95	94	98	94	84	9
10,000 and over	19	97	97	99	97	91	6
14-34		93	79	93	86	72	16
Number . . (Thousands)	9,204						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	2	79	46	63	62	32	29
1,000-1,999	3	83	45	71	69	31	28

Continued—



Table 2.—Percent of households reporting specified items by age and color of employed male head in civilian labor force, and family income in 1959, United States, 1960—Continued

(Percents independently rounded and do not always equal 100)							
Age and color of household head and family income		Percent in each income category reporting					
		Automobile	Telephone	Hot piped	House	Items	More than
		available	available	water inside	in	(1)	1.00
				structure	sound	through	person
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	per
		Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	room
White:							
14-34 (Continued)							
2,000-2,999	6	82	46	77	70	27	24
3,000-3,999	10	90	59	88	74	45	23
4,000-4,999	14	90	72	94	85	58	17
5,000-6,999	33	94	85	97	90	72	15
7,000-9,999	22	97	93	99	93	85	11
10,000 and over	8	98	96	99	97	90	9
35-54		93	87	94	89	78	12
Number . . (Thousands)	16,849						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	2	80	58	66	64	41	17
1,000-1,999	3	82	57	66	68	43	19
2,000-2,999	4	85	60	74	68	40	22
3,000-3,999	6	84	73	84	75	46	20
4,000-4,999	9	89	78	91	82	59	16
5,000-6,999	26	93	88	96	88	74	14
7,000-9,999	27	96	94	98	94	86	10
10,000 and over	23	98	97	99	97	92	7
55 and over		87	85	92	88	71	3
Number . . (Thousands)	6,813						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	4	66	50	64	66	28	3
1,000-1,999	6	79	60	66	73	36	4
2,000-2,999	8	78	71	82	78	50	4
3,000-3,999	9	82	81	88	84	50	2
4,000-4,999	11	83	83	94	86	62	3
5,000-6,999	21	87	89	96	90	70	3
7,000-9,999	19	90	94	98	93	77	3
10,000 and over	22	94	96	99	97	89	3
Nonwhite:							
14 years old and over		66	58	68	59	40	33
Number . . (Thousands)	2,856						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$1,000	8	52	17	22	30	2	42
1,000-1,999	13	49	28	37	38	6	37
2,000-2,999	16	52	45	55	51	17	37
3,000-3,999	15	63	58	69	58	23	34
4,000-4,999	14	64	67	82	66	32	34
5,000-6,999	18	76	76	89	71	41	31
7,000-9,999	11	82	82	93	80	60	23
10,000 and over	4	87	90	95	84	68	12
14-34		62	48	70	62	36	40
Number . . (Thousands)	831						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$3,000	39	41	24	44	48	8	46
3,000-4,999	32	64	55	79	66	28	42
5,000 and over	30	76	74	94	75	46	29
35-54		70	62	69	59	45	34
Number . . (Thousands)	1,511						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$3,000	33	57	35	40	39	13	43
3,000-4,999	30	64	64	73	60	28	34
5,000 and over	39	82	83	90	77	55	28
55 and over		62	61	63	55	37	15
Number . . (Thousands)	514						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$3,000	44	52	41	39	40	19	17
3,000-4,999	28	61	71	73	60	31	16
5,000 and over	28	74	82	91	74	39	13

See footnote to table 1.

Table 3.—Percent of households with employed male head, white and nonwhite, in civilian labor force reporting specified items by urban-rural residence and family income in 1959, United States, 1960

(Percents not shown where base is less than 100,000)

Residence and family income	Total households with employed male head in civilian labor force	Percent with																	
		Automobile available			Telephone available			Hot piped water inside structure			House in sound condition			Items (1) through (4)			More than 1.00 person per room		
		(1)			(2)			(3)			(4)			(5)			(6)		
		Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white
		:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	Thou.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
United States	35,722	90	92	64	82	84	58	91	93	68	86	88	59	68	71	28	13	12	33
Under \$3,000	4,836	74	81	51	51	56	33	65	72	41	64	70	42	31	38	10	21	16	38
3,000 and over	30,886	92	93	72	87	88	72	96	96	84	89	90	70	74	76	40	12	11	29
Urban	25,583	88	90	63	86	88	67	97	98	83	89	91	67	73	76	36	12	10	29
Under 3,000	2,267	65	72	43	58	63	46	84	91	64	71	77	54	34	41	16	20	15	33
3,000 and over	23,316	90	92	70	89	90	75	98	99	90	91	92	72	76	79	43	11	10	27
Rural	10,139	93	95	68	72	75	25	77	81	16	77	80	32	56	59	4	17	15	47
Under 3,000	2,569	82	87	60	45	51	14	49	57	8	58	64	24	29	35	2	22	17	46
3,000 and over	7,570	97	97	91	81	82	47	87	88	32	83	84	48	65	66	12	15	14	50
Nonfarm	7,339	93	95	65	73	76	30	81	84	19	79	81	36	60	63	5	17	16	43
Under 3,000	1,367	77	83	53	39	44	18	48	56	10	54	61	27	25	31	2	25	22	41
3,000 and over	5,972	97	97	92	81	82	49	88	90	33	84	85	51	68	69	12	15	14	47
Farm	2,800	92	94	73	68	73	15	69	74	9	71	75	24	44	49	4	16	12	54
Under 3,000	1,202	87	91	69	52	59	9	50	58	5	61	68	21	32	39	2	18	12	53
3,000 and over	1,598	97	97	—	81	82	—	82	84	—	78	79	—	54	56	—	14	13	—

Table 4.—Number and percent of households with employed male head in civilian labor force, urban and rural, by family income in 1959, North and West and South, 1960

Family income	North and West				South			
	Total	Urban	Rural : nonfarm	Rural : farm	Total	Urban	Rural : nonfarm	Rural : farm
Total:								
Number (Thousands)	25,694	19,454	4,548	1,692	10,028	6,129	2,791	1,108
Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under \$3,000	9	6	12	36	24	16	30	53
3,000 and over	91	94	88	64	76	84	70	47
7,000 and over	45	49	35	21	30	38	21	12
White:								
Number (Thousands)	24,321	18,148	4,498	1,675	8,545	5,206	2,429	910
Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under 3,000	9	6	11	36	19	12	24	47
3,000 and over	91	94	89	64	81	88	76	53
7,000 and over	46	51	35	21	35	43	24	14
Percent reporting all items in summary measure of level of living								
Total	72	74	70	57	56	68	41	26
Under 3,000	43	39	46	50	19	29	13	14
3,000 and over	75	76	73	62	69	76	56	40
7,000 and over	86	87	86	69	85	90	76	49
White	74	76	71	58	63	75	47	33
Under 3,000	46	43	47	51	26	37	17	20
3,000 and over	77	78	73	62	72	30	58	43
7,000 and over	87	88	87	69	86	91	76	50

See footnote to table 1.

Table 5.—Percent of households reporting specified items by occupation of employed male head in the civilian labor force, and family income in 1959, United States, 1960

(Percents independently rounded and do not always equal 100)

Occupation of household head and family income		Percent in each income category reporting					
		Automobile available	Telephone available	Hot piped water inside structure	House in sound condition	Items (1) through (4)	More than 1.00 person per room
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Professional and technical; managers, officials and proprietors except farm		95	94	99	96	87	6
Number . . (Thousands)	8,393						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$5,000	17	86	83	95	88	64	8
5,000-6,999	20	94	93	99	94	84	10
7,000-9,999	27	96	97	100	97	89	6
10,000 and over	36	98	98	100	99	94	3
Clerical and sales workers		92	91	98	94	83	8
Number . . (Thousands)	4,784						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$5,000	25	83	80	94	87	63	10
5,000-6,999	29	92	92	99	93	80	10
7,000-9,999	26	95	96	100	96	90	6
10,000 and over	20	97	98	100	99	95	5
Craftsmen, foremen; operatives and kindred workers		91	81	92	84	69	16
Number . . (Thousands)	14,523						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$5,000	32	82	62	80	72	40	22
5,000-6,999	32	92	85	95	86	67	15
7,000-9,999	25	96	92	98	91	82	12
10,000 and over	12	96	95	99	94	86	11
Service workers; laborers except farm and mine		80	70	84	74	58	20
Number . . (Thousands)	4,085						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$5,000	55	70	57	75	65	37	23
Under 3,000	25	57	42	64	56	19	26
3,000-4,999	30	78	68	84	73	43	21
5,000-6,999	24	88	82	92	83	64	18
7,000-9,999	15	88	88	97	88	72	13
10,000 and over	6	92	93	96	88	82	15
Farmers and farm managers		93	69	69	73	47	13
Number . . (Thousands)	2,101						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$5,000	72	91	63	62	70	41	14
Under 3,000	49	89	56	54	66	38	14
3,000-4,999	23	96	78	79	80	45	15
5,000 and over	28	98	85	87	81	60	10
Farm laborers and foremen		81	40	52	48	25	32
Number . . (Thousands)	557						
Percent . . . . .	100						
Under \$5,000	82	78	33	44	42	22	35
Under 3,000	60	68	22	31	35	12	38
3,000-4,999	22	94	63	79	61	46	28
5,000 and over	18	93	73	90	78	42	19

See footnote to table 1.

Table 6.—Percent of households with employed male head 35-54 years old in civilian labor force reporting specified items by selected major occupation group, color, and family income in 1959, United States 1960

Selected major occupation group,color, and family income	Total	Automobile	Telephone	Hot piped	House	Items	More
		available	available	water inside	in	(1)	than
				structure	sound	through	1.00
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	person
	Thou.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	per
							room
Craftsmen, foremen; operatives and kindred workers:							
White:							
Under \$5,000	1,681	84	67	82	72	46	22
5,000 - 6,999	2,219	94	86	95	86	69	16
7,000 and over	3,271	97	94	99	93	85	11
Nonwhite:							
Under 5,000	303	61	56	64	55	18	35
5,000 - 6,999	148	81	79	90	68	44	33
7,000 and over	112	85	86	93	77	61	24
Service workers; laborers except farm and mine:							
White:							
Under 3,000	224	71	46	69	60	30	18
3,000 - 4,999	374	84	71	85	75	52	20
5,000 and over	840	91	88	95	86	75	16
Nonwhite:							
Under 3,000	183	47	41	51	43	10	38
3,000 - 4,999	163	66	63	70	55	25	36
5,000 and over	155	80	80	85	75	55	41

See footnote to table 1.

Table 7.—Percent of primary families <sup>1/</sup> living in nondilapidated housing with all plumbing facilities, urban and rural, by family income in 1959, United States, 1960

Family income in 1959	Number of families	Percent in nondilapidated housing with all plumbing facilities				
		United States	Urban	Rural	Rural nonfarm	Rural farm
	Thou.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Total	26,455	85	93	68	71	58
Under \$2,000	2,688	50	71	30	30	32
2,000-3,999	4,340	71	82	55	55	56
4,000-7,999	12,438	91	95	80	82	72
8,000 and over	6,989	97	98	92	93	84
Nonwhite	2,691	56	72	14	16	6
Under \$2,000	856	31	54	5	6	3
2,000-3,999	802	53	66	16	17	9
4,000-7,999	798	77	83	36	38	23
8,000 and over	235	89	92	57	57	48

<sup>1/</sup> Families with children under 18 years old and with no nonrelatives present.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports. Families. Final Report PC(2)-4A. Washington. 1964. Table 33.